

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-27, and 29-31 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 8-16, 18-20, 22-27, and 29-31 are amended herein. Claims 7, 17, and 28 are cancelled herein. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 21-27, and 29-31 stand withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicant notes that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on November 2, 2005, is not a duplicate copy of the IDS filed on October 27, 2005. The IDS filed on November 2, 2005, included a translation of the JP 2001-138508 reference which was not included in the IDS filed on October 27, 2005.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. In particular, the Abstract has been objected to. Applicant has amended the specification herein to replace the Abstract. By this amendment, Applicant believes that this objection has been rendered moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 1 stands objected to for certain informalities. Claim 1 has been amended herein. By this amendment, Applicant believes that this objection has been rendered

moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 11-13 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sohl et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,509,057). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In Sohl et al., a light beam is passed from optical fiber 19 to optical fiber 23. See at least Figure 1 and column 2, lines 23-25 of the Sohl et al. reference. In Sohl et al., the light beam is used for detecting a position of a droplet. The apparatus shown in Figure 1 has a function that calibrates the ejectors and corrects positional errors of the droplets. See at least column 1, lines 42-44 and column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 15 of the Sohl et al. reference.

On the contrary, the present invention relates to separating a liquid column from a liquid stored in a pressure chamber. Specifically, independent claim 1 includes a feature of "a droplet separator that is adapted to give, to the liquid column, an energy that separates the liquid column from the liquid stored in the pressure chamber." Applicant submits that there is no disclosure of such a droplet separator in Sohl et al. Furthermore, independent claim 1 includes a feature of "a controller that is adapted to control the droplet separator to give an energy at a timing when a predetermined time period has elapsed since the start timing detected by the ejection timing detector." Applicant submits that there is also no disclosure of such a controller in Sohl et al.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Sohl et al.

Claim 11 includes similar subject matter as claim 1. In particular, claim 11 calls for a droplet ejecting method including "giving, to the liquid column, an energy that separates the liquid column from the liquid stored in the pressure chamber, the energy being given at a timing when a predetermined time period has elapsed since the start timing." Accordingly, for at least the same reasons state above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 11 is not anticipated by Sohl et al.

Claims 12-13 and 16-19 all depend from claim 11 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should also be patentable.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sohl et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,509,057) in view of Endo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,513,900). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 14-15 and 20 all depend from claim 11 and, therefore, for at least the same reasons, should also be patentable.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 23, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/DWH/pvd